



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,957	02/23/2004	Ming-Wei Juang	JUAN3018/EM	7573
23364 7590 01/23/2008 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
SWARTZ, JAMIE H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3694				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,957

Applicant(s)

JUANG ET AL.

Examiner

JAMIE H. SWARTZ

Art Unit

3694

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 4 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Regarding claims 4 and 10, the phrase "where the specific time period is selected from the group" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether or not the group is a set of options given to the user, or how the specific time period is selected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader et al. (US 5903881 A) in view of Lomet (US 6754657 B2).

6. Regarding claim 1, Schrader teaches a computing device capable of time sorting (see at least abstract, col. 7, lines 58-65, col. 12, lines 35-52, col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 12). Schrader teaches a display module for displaying a value (see at least col. 5, line 65 – col. 7, line 12). Schrader teaches an input module for inputting, and having at least one save key for saving the value displayed in the display module, and at least one summation key for computing a saved value (see at least col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 53-61, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Schrader teaches a memory for saving the value received from the input module after the at least one save key being pressed (see at least col. 12, line 35 – col. 13, line 7). Schrader teaches a clock for providing a corresponding time parameter while the memory is saving the value (see at least col. 12, line 35 – col. 13, line 7). Schrader teaches a microprocessor for receiving a save command after the save key of the input module being pressed, controlling the memory to save the value in conjunction with the corresponding time parameter provided by the clock according to the save command, and receiving a summation command after the summation key of the input module being pressed for computing a summation of the value saved in the memory (see at least Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 53, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 53-61, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Schrader discloses a computer which uses Windows based software. Windows is known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to contain timestamps when saving data. Lomet teaches an example of a timestamp database system invented by Microsoft (col. 6, line 45-col. 20, line 25).

7. Regarding claim 2, Schrader teaches wherein the at least one save key of the input module comprises an income save key for saving an income value displayed in the display module in the memory, and an expense save key for saving an expense value displayed in the display module in the memory (see at least Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 53, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 35-61, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20).

8. Regarding claim 3, Schrader teaches wherein the memory defines an income save unit for saving the income value, and an expense save unit for saving the expense value. see at least (Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 53, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 35-61, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Moving functionality from one software unit to another is an old and well-known technique that would fall under routine creativity and logic to one of ordinary skill in the art. It was later formalized as refactoring, which is referred to in US Patent 6668325, filed 1998 by Collberg et al., col 25, lines 62-68. Thus any known functionality can be moved to a unit of any name.

9. Regarding claim 4, Schrader teaches wherein a summation of the values saved in the memory that occurred during a specific time period is computed after the summation key is pressed, where the specific time period is selected from the group of: each past day, each past week, each past month, each past season, and a year (see at

Art Unit: 3694

least Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 53, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 53-61, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20, col. 9, lines 6 – 15, col. 18, lines 7 - 17).

10. Regarding claim 6, Schrader teaches a computing device containing a display module, a input module, a memory, a clock, and a microprocessor. Schrader does not specifically state RAM. However, RAM was taught in connection with computers at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to use RAM in a computer. It would have also been obvious for Schrader to include details of the type of memory that was common place in computers within the specification of the invention. Lomet includes the details of RAM in reference to the claimed computer system (col. 6, line 45-col. 20, line 25).

11. Regarding claim 7, Schrader teaches receiving an input command (see at least col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 35 – col. 13, line 65, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Schrader teaches executing the input command and displaying a value corresponding to the input command (see at least col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 35 – col. 13, line 65, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Schrader teaches receiving a save command for saving the value (see at least col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 35 – col. 13, line 65, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Schrader teaches saving the value in conjunction with a corresponding time parameter in a memory according to the save command (see at

Art Unit: 3694

least col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 35 – col. 13, line 65, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Schrader discloses a computer which uses Windows based software. Windows is known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to contain timestamps when saving data. Lomet teaches an example of a timestamp database system invented by Microsoft (col. 6, line 45-col. 20, line 25).

12. Regarding claim 8, Schrader teaches wherein the memory defines an income save unit for saving an income value, and an expense save unit for saving an expense value, and the value to be saved according to the save command being selected from the group of: the income value and the expense value (Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 53, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 53-61, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20, col. 12, lines 35-52). Moving functionality from one software unit to another is an old and well-known technique that would fall under routine creativity and logic to one of ordinary skill in the art. It was later formalized as refactoring, which is referred to in US Patent 6668325, filed 1998 by Collberg et al., col 25, lines 62-68. Thus any known functionality can be moved to a unit of any name.

13. Regarding claim 9, Schrader teaches receiving a summation command (see at least Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 61, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20). Schrader teaches computing a summation of the value saved in the memory according to the summation command

Art Unit: 3694

(see at least Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 61, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20).

14. Regarding claim 10, Schrader teaches computing the summation of the value saved in the memory that occurred during a specific time period which is selected from the group of: each past day, each past week, each past month, each past season, and a year (see at least Figure 7, col. 12, lines 34 – 53, col. 6, lines 38 – 67, col. 9, lines 19-29, col. 12 lines 53-61, col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 10, col. 13, line 65 – col. 14, line 20, col. 9, lines 6 – 15, col. 18, lines 7 - 17).

15. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader et al. (US 5903881 A) in view of Lomet (US 6754657 B2) in view of Official Notice.

16. Regarding claim 5, Schrader teaches a computing device containing a display module, an input module, a memory, a clock, and a microprocessor. Lomet teaches time stamping of data items associated with a transaction. The combination of Schrader and Lomet does not specifically teach a multi-functional key. However, Official Notice is taken that at the time of the invention a standard computer keyboard included multi-functional keys.

17. Examiner's Note: The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims for the convenience of the applicant.

Art Unit: 3694

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner. The Examiner would also like to note that the use of the Lomet patent was used to show elements not specifically stated by the Schrader reference but were inherently taught by the reference.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMIE H. SWARTZ whose telephone number is (571)272-7363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3694

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jamie H Swartz/
Examiner, Art Unit 3694

/James P Trammell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694